

do so by a Federal law enforcement officer.

Mr. Speaker, America's ports remain vulnerable and this Nation needs a multifaceted strategy to secure them and to deter those who would harm this country. The Reducing Crime and Terrorism at America's Seaports Act of 2005 is part of that strategy.

I urge my colleagues to join Chairman COBLE and me by cosponsoring this legislation.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### BORDER CONTROL AND AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this month a bill to grant amnesty to illegal immigrants was introduced in the United States Senate.

I think we should send a very clear message to the other body not to waste their time or ours on any bill dealing with the status of illegal immigrants until we first secure our borders.

What good does it do to try to address the problems of 11 to 16 million people who are here illegally if we do not address the gaping wound that allowed them in this country to start with?

The majority of illegals simply walk across our woefully undermanned 2,000-mile border with Mexico. We could deport them back to their country of origin, and millions would be pouring back across that same border within hours. We could turn our backs on justice and the rule of law and declare everyone here as now to be legal. Within hours we would have millions more illegal immigrants walking across that same border, encouraged by the fact that they could laugh at our laws with impunity.

Either extreme, or anything in between, is pointless while we let our border continue to bleed. Trying to defend 1,951 miles of border against 4 million illegal immigrants a year with just 10,817 border patrol officers is a mathematical impossibility.

This month Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Robert Bonner

told the House Committee on Government Reform that we could secure the border, that we could secure the border, with an additional 50,000 auxiliary officers. That figure is in very close agreement with the draft field research by the Immigration Reform Caucus that was reported this week by the Washington Times, CNN's Lou Dobbs, and Fox News, which estimates 36,000 auxiliaries may accomplish the same purpose.

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger of California and Janet Napolitano of Arizona, Bill Richardson of New Mexico, and Governor Rick Perry of Texas can order their National Guard, with support from other States through the National Guard Bureau, to secure their section of their border today. We have already authorized the Secretary of Defense to pay the cost of that deployment in last year's Defense Authorization Act. In addition, we are bringing home 70,000 Federal troops from around the world, where they have been guarding other nations' borders for the past 60 years. A simple executive order from the President would allow them to relieve our National Guard and have 20,000 men and women to spare.

All it takes, Mr. Speaker, is will. We have the manpower and we have the money.

Mr. Speaker, on May 5 the American people responded to a Zogby nationwide poll on this issue. They approve using Federal troops to secure our border by a 53 to 40 percent margin. They approve using State and local law agencies to help secure our border by an 81 to 14 percent margin. They oppose an amnesty plan like that proposed in the Senate by a 56 to 35 percent margin.

This week, after the border patrol draft reported by caucus investigators was released, CNN online polls were running 92 percent in favor of using our military to control our borders. In response, the Mexican Government this week spoke out against us securing our border with our troops.

The American public demands we do so.

Now is the time for every Member of this body to choose whose side we are on.

#### SMART SECURITY AND THE NEED FOR AN IRAQ PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to take a good, hard look at the role the United States is playing in Iraq and whether or not it is in our national interest to maintain a military presence.

We need to acknowledge the fact that Iraq's insurgency is growing in strength, not diminishing, and that the very presence of 150,000 American troops on Iraqi soil appears as though they see us as occupiers that actually

unites the growing collection of insurgent forces.

Since our military presence actually encourages further fighting, this war will continue as long as U.S. troops remain in Iraq. That is why Congress must accept the fact that we cannot possibly bring our involvement in Iraq to any kind of successful conclusion through military means.

Yesterday, during consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, I offered an amendment urging the President to develop a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. Surprisingly, this was the first time the House has formally debated the possibility of withdrawal from Iraq. We were allotted only 30 minutes for the debate: 15 minutes on my side, 15 minutes on the side opposing my amendment. But it is no surprise, of course, the amendment was defeated. But in spite of that, it is clear that the Congress is starting to get serious about a plan for leaving Iraq. 128 Members, including five Republicans, voted for this amendment.

But there is much more work to do, Mr. Speaker. The Iraq war has now raged on for more than 2 years, and we are no closer to winning this conflict than we were when President Bush declared an end to major combat operations under an arrogant banner declaring "Mission Accomplished."

Despite this lack of progress, the war has exacted a deeply troubling human and financial toll. In just over 2 years of war, more than 1,600 American soldiers and an estimated 25,000 Iraqi innocents have been killed. The Pentagon lists the number of Americans wounded as just over 12,000. But that does not take into account even the invisible wounds many of our soldiers will be bringing home and have already brought home, the painful mental trauma they have contracted from months and years of fighting. When accounting for these psychological injuries, the number of wounded jumps to nearly 40,000.

To date, Congress has appropriated more than \$200 billion for military operations in Iraq, despite little to no oversight as to how these funds are going to be spent, which has allowed \$9 billion in reconstruction funds to just vanish from the coffers of the Coalition Provisional Authority, which was the American governing body that managed Iraq until the year 2004.

Given what is at stake here, do the American people not deserve a plan? Do our brave men and women, who are selflessly sacrificing their lives, not to mention their arms, legs, for a war that we should not be in in the first place, not deserve a plan?

Let us not forget that the legislative branch is constitutionally mandated to oversee expenditures from our National Treasury. Instead of allowing fat-cat war profiteers like Halliburton and its subsidiary, Kellogg, Brown and Root, to line their pockets as war profiteers, it is time Congress started fulfilling our responsibility.

We must develop a smarter agenda. We must develop an agenda that will help Iraq, and we will then be able to reduce our military occupation. We must insist on planning by the Bush administration. This 2-year war has left us disturbingly weak against the true security threats we face. Let us not forget that Osama bin Laden is still at large and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq as well as the rest of the Middle East.

Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future: the SMART Security concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 158, which I recently reintroduced with the support of 49 of my House colleagues. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. It will help us address the threats we face as a Nation. SMART Security will prevent terrorism by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunity. Instead of rushing off to war under false pretenses, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN POLICY IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, allow me to address a very deep and growing concern about American policy in the Balkans. The policy of the United States should be predicated upon its own interests and its own sovereignty and security. Defying reason, somehow we keep hearing that the current administration plans to continue the former administration's policy in Southeast Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand this, given the fact that we have learned so much about the nature of the foreign fighters that have come into Bosnia-Herzegovina to fight the Serbs, and now we have encountered them ourselves in Iraq.

To observe the current unemployment and socialist economic structure in Kosovo is to recognize that the previous administration's so-called policy there has been an absolute and utter failure. I certainly agree that we should be looking for a workable solution for all in that region; but in order to do so, we cannot disregard the fact that there have been over 300 mosques constructed in Kosovo since 1999, mostly funded by Saudi Arabia, while at the very same time, 150 Serbian churches, Orthodox churches, about 10 percent of all the churches in Kosovo, have been destroyed. And I am wondering if this is the legacy that we want to leave for the United States involvement, Mr. Speaker.

Further, we can now clearly see that many of the most dangerous terrorists that the United States has encountered in the fight against terrorism have had some connection to the Balkans and particularly Bosnia. For example, two of the September 11 hijackers fought in the wars in Bosnia. Sohel al Saahli fought in Afghanistan, Bosnia, and Chechnya; and he later became a leader in Iraq and was killed in a U.S. air strike in March of 2003. Abdel Aziz al Muqrin, al Qaeda's leader in Saudi Arabia, personally decapitated Paul Johnson; and he had fought in Bosnia, Algeria, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alarming pattern here.

Abu Anas al Shami fought with other Jordanian extremists to fight jihad in Bosnia. He was the right hand of Abu Masab al Zarqawi fighting against U.S. forces in Iraq until he was killed in September, 2004.

And, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our Balkans policies helped these terrorists.

And now there is data found on Mr. Zarqawi's laptop computer indicating that terrorists have the means and the plans to use WMDs here in Europe and perhaps even here someday, in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, given these disturbing details, the fact that we are now moving troops out of Bosnia and out of the Balkans is a profound concern to me. Further, as a guarantor of the Dayton Peace Accords, we have a duty to reaffirm them and to ensure a sense of comity and fair play. We should not seek to change them through a coercive top-down pressure, as has been recently attempted in the talks in Bosnia under the auspices of the High Representative, Paddy Ashdown, and this with the approval of our U.S. Ambassador Douglas McElhane.

I am also very concerned that, according to news reports, our ambassador incited public opinion against the Republic of Srpska's chief of police by insinuating that he should be removed from office for statements he made concerning the nexus between Bosnia and the Madrid bombings.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, the police chief's statements concerning the relationship be-

tween certain individuals and materials in Bosnia and the horrific Madrid bombings that took place last year deserve our attention and our investigation rather than our rebuke. I truly believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time we take a second, very serious look at the realities and the growing terrorist danger in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IN OPPOSITION TO CANCELLATION OF GENOCIDE CONFERENCE IN TURKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to voice my outrage and great disappointment about a recent development in Turkey. A conference set to begin yesterday in Bogazici University, of Turkish scholars and academics, entitled "Ottoman Armenians During the Decline of the Empire: Issues of Scientific Responsibility and Democracy," was indefinitely postponed by the university organizers.

According to Agence France-Presse, Turkish Justice Minister Cemil Cicek yesterday accused conference organizers of committing treason, saying, "We must put an end to this cycle of treason and insults, of spreading propaganda against the Turkish nation by people who belong to it." In addition, Turkish officials have demanded copies of all papers submitted to the conference.

The development further affirms the speculation that the image that the Turkish Government has attempted to create for itself is nothing more than a desperate attempt to create a facade. Contrary to what Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan and other Turkish officials would have us believe, the Government of Turkey is not democratic, is not committed to creating a democracy, is not making an effort to create better relations with Armenia and is definitely not ready to join the European Union.

Over the last year, we have witnessed the Government of Turkey attempt to move towards democratization. However, the manner in which they have chosen to do so is an insult to any truly democratic government. Their attempts have included the adoption of a penal code that, in reality, represents a dramatic display of the Turkish government's campaign to deny the Armenian genocide. Furthermore, this new criminal code further hindered improved relations between the Republic of Armenia and Turkey.